

## Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - California

Matrix for Reviewing State Level Standards									
Part I: Implications for Instruction			Ratings:	2-Yes	1-Inconsistent	0-Not Evident	Notes		
			DW	KL	OO	LM			
Appropriate Sequencing for Instruction			2	2	3	3	The framework is explicit when explaining progressions in the 4 domains from one grade level to the next. In the areas of middle school and high school writing, the framework clearly sets out ways in which teachers can effectively convert the standards to instruction. These methods, while comprehensive, do not limit flexibility. The framework also alludes to ancillary teaching materials available to any CA teachers who need help converting the standards to instruction. The		
Indication of Minimum Achievement			2	2	3	2	The strengths of the California framework include the following: a philosophy of teaching ELA sets the tone for teacher dispositions, classroom climate, and expectations of students; grade-level proficiency is established as minimal mastery, and the conversion to the instruction is facilitated by a series of Instructional Profiles (see p. 9) designed to help the teacher with assessment, differentiation, and other aspects of lesson delivery. The Instructional Profiles tool would be ideal for PLC development. In order to help teachers determine instructional priorities, the substrands and strands serve as benchmarks for gauging what the students should have mastered at specific times during the year (see p. 7).		
Efficient Conversion to Instruction			2	3	3	3	The framework provides suggestions for differentiation and outlines pre-requisite skills needed for each grade level. The framework in which the standards are embedded provide adequate guidance to teachers for implementation.		
Age Appropriate Skills and Concepts			3	3	2	2	The CA standards provide a clear framework for teachers when planning instruction. Each grade level/ cluster is preceded by a document detailing assessments, and provides information to help with differentiating (Universal Access). They provide essential information on how to benchmark the standards. Emphasis is placed on ensuring students read grade-level text. This will help with school-wide literacy goals to ensure all students meet minimum proficiency levels. Writing goals place importance on age appropriate business and technical writing skills.		
Total			9	10	11	10			
Part II: Clarity and Focus			Rating:	3-Wording supports understanding, purpose, & expectation	2-Wording moderately supports understanding, purpose, & expectation	1-Wording does not support understanding, purpose & expectation	Notes		
			DW	KL	OO	LM			
Understanding by Teachers			3	3	3	3	The framework cites the research it utilizes and clearly explains the pedagogical theory that lies behind certain curricular decisions. For teachers, this leads to a better understanding of the "why" – why are they being asked to teach these standards in this way at this particular point in a student's development? Such transparency leads to better overall understanding on the part of the teacher.		

## Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - California

Understanding by Parents/General Public	2	2	3	2	Part II of the framework provides invaluable information pertaining to ELA pedagogy (e.g., instructional grouping and scheduling, instructional materials, recommended time allotments, etc.). Part II helps to erase any ambiguity pertaining to the meanings of the standards. Streamlining is achieved through a hierarchy that moves from general to specific (see p. 8). The developers are clear as to the intended users of the framework: 1) teachers and other ELA educators and 2) publishers of ELA programs and materials (see p. 2).
Streamlined Learning Expectations/Concise	3	3	3	3	Standards are precise and generally concise in their wording. Teachers will not have to "dig" to uncover the intent of standards. The framework is user-friendly and provides a clear progression of skills. The actual organization of the standards is quite efficient for teachers- there is no switching back and forth between unpacking documents.
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>Part III: Implementation and Sustainability</b>	<b>Ratings</b>	<b>3-Heavy</b>	<b>2-Moderate</b>	<b>1-Marginal</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<b>DW</b>	<b>KL</b>	<b>OO</b>	<b>LM</b>	
Professional Development	2	2	3	1	Much acclimation/unpacking of the standards could be done in school level PLCs; additional PD may be needed to sure up teachers' pedagogy and build upon the differentiation strategies suggested in the framework.
Technology	2	2	2	2	The framework indicates multiple times that ideally at the middle school level, and definitely by the high school level, social studies and science teachers also share the responsibility for teaching comprehension of informational texts. The CA framework acknowledges this may require PD in order to be implemented with fidelity.
Textbooks	3	3	3	3	Framework provides general guidance on the types of materials in which teachers need to use to facilitate learning; it is specifically stated that teachers should not be expected to create the curriculum materials. LEAS would have to align existing resources or buy resources to support implementation.
Personnel	1	1	2	1	In order to ensure the long-term efficacy of this framework, districts must invest sufficient dollars in professional development. This variety in the content supports differentiation by topical interests (e.g., Components of Language Arts, Student Motivation, etc.), leadership suggestions (e.g., instructional scheduling, instructional programs, and administrative practices), and general suggestions for planning professional development (see p. 18).
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	
<b>Part IV: Readiness for Next Level of Learning</b>	<b>Ratings</b>	<b>3-Strong evidence</b>	<b>2-Moderate Evidence</b>	<b>1-Minimal Evidence</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<b>DW</b>	<b>KL</b>	<b>OO</b>	<b>LM</b>	
K-5 Standards Only: Standards allow for learners to attain essential, foundational skills to build upon for reading in grades 6-12			3		The levels of reading, writing and speaking required of the standards by grades 11 and 12 clearly leave students poised to enter post-secondary education with the requisite skills.
Grades 6-12 Standards Only: Standards will prepare students for academic demand of ACT/SAT as gateway tests for post-secondary admissions	3	3		3	As students move into upper grade levels; the framework states explicitly that learning and interaction with content becomes more complex. Students move from "learning to read" to "reading to learn". I like the fact that it is explicitly stated in the framework that all students are expected to master the same standards, but the framework provides the differentiation support needed to help teachers to support mastery.

# Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - California

		<b>Total</b>	3	3	3	3	The progression of skills specifically from 9-12th grades in writing and speaking are			
		<b>Grand Total</b>	28	29	33	28				
(link to standards: <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/rlafw.pdf">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/rlafw.pdf</a> )										

## Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - Texas

Matrix for Reviewing State Level Standards									
Part I: Implications for Instruction			Ratings:	2-Yes	1-Inconsistent	0-Not Evident	Notes		
			DW	KL	OO	LM			
Appropriate Sequencing for Instruction			2	1	2	2	Standards progress in logical sequence and increasing complexity		
Indication of Minimum Achievement			1	0	0	1	Performance indicators are not included within the standards. I found a separate ancillary document that gave parents/teachers more explicit information about mastery at each grade level.		
Efficient Conversion to Instruction			1	1	2	1	While some of the standards are very easy to interpret and transfer to instruction others leave a lot up to interpretation as they are very general. There are no exemplars that will guide teachers. See link at the end of the matrix. Standards progress through the high school sequence with a great deal of overlap and repetition. It is not clearly indicated which standards are to be addressed when, and to what degree. The organization is not particularly user friendly- strands are difficult to isolate. There is little evidence of minimum achievement guidelines. Additionally, there are no embedded exemplars for teachers.		
Age Appropriate Skills and Concepts			2	2	2	2	The English Language Arts and Reading (ELAR) of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) are divided into five strands. Although the Reading strand is sequenced across grade levels, the degree of specificity is inconsistent. For example, in the area of Reading/Comprehension of Literary Text, three skills overlap grades 1-3. To the fullest extent possible, a teacher would be wise to cascade the instruction of overlapping skills during a single year. Doing so will result in deep understanding by students. The careful refinement of standards will help teachers examine knowledge and skills on the basis of what is developmentally appropriate for instruction. The TEKS lacks a framework for conveying a philosophy basis, underpinning research, and guiding pedagogy. Additionally, have several instructional exemplars would improve teachers' efforts to implement the TEKS with confidence.		
Total			6	4	6	6			
Part II: Clarity and Focus			Rating:	3-Wording supports understanding, purpose, & expectation	2-Wording moderately supports understanding, purpose, & expectation	1 Wording does not support understanding, purpose & expectation	Notes		
			DW	KL	OO	LM			
Understanding by Teachers			2	2	3	2	The developers have written this document for understanding and application by elementary education teachers and curriculum specialists/leaders. For these purposes, the document is well written. The fact that the specialized language might pose problems for parents and the general public does not detract from the reliability of the TEKS content. With some professional assistance, parents of young students would gain a basic understanding TEKS expectations.		
Understanding by Parents/General Public			2	2	2	2	Both teachers and parents would find the ancillary document that Denise linked to this matrix to be helpful in terms of understanding expectations for students.		
Streamlined Learning Expectations/Concise			2	2	2	2			
Total			6	6	7	6			
Part III: Implementation and Sustainability			Ratings	3-Heavy	2-Moderate	1-Marginal	Notes		

## Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - Texas

[illegible]

# Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - Virginia

Matrix for Reviewing State Level Standards											
Part I: Implications for Instruction			Ratings:	2-Yes	1-Inconsistent	0-Not Evident	Notes				
			DW	KL	OO	LM					
Appropriate Sequencing for Instruction			2	2	2	2	As written in the standards, as well as shown in the Curriculum Framework, sequencing of standards is truly appropriate for secondary students. Foundational skills are addressed in 9th grade, and build systematically through the 12th. The Curriculum Framework provides clear definitions of essential understandings, as well as essential knowledge, skills, and processes to show mastery of each standard. These standards could quite easily be converted into instruction by seasoned and beginning teachers alike. Standards seem to be written with an eye for developmental appropriateness.				
Indication of Minimum Achievement			0	2	2	2	While each grade level's standards are preceded by an overview that describes the major concepts and skills that each student will be expected to understand and demonstrate, there was no evidence of set expectations (to what degree) students should be able to understand and demonstrate the standards in order to achieve mastery/proficiency.				
Efficient Conversion to Instruction			2	2	2	2					
Age Appropriate Skills and Concepts			2	2	2	2	The side-by-side comparison points out that Virginia relies on extensive research supporting the instruction of reading at the learner's instructional comprehension level. Relying on pre-determined text complexity levels, as indicated in the CCSS, in in opposition to developmentally appropriate practice.				
Total			6	8	8	8					
Part II: Clarity and Focus			Rating:	3-Wording supports understanding, purpose, & expectation	2-Wording moderately supports understanding, purpose, & expectation	1-Wording does not support understanding, purpose & expectation	Notes				
			DW	KL	OO	LM					
Understanding by Teachers			3	3	3	3	The standards are incredibly compact but are not vague. Expectations are clear, and terminology is used consistently (main idea vs. theme). Standards are written so as to be user-friendly for teachers, parents, and other interested parties, and lack excessive use of topic-specific jargon. The standards build upon one another in a clear, and easily discerned manner. Teachers can quite easily see where standards link and build across grade levels. Standards build rather than overlap.				
Understanding by Parents/General Public			2	3	3	2	Virginia provides a web-based portals, which allows parents to review students' writing samples as well as the standards for teaching writing.				
Streamlined Learning Expectations/Concise			3	3	3	3					
Total			8	9	9	8					
Part III: Implementation and Sustainability			Ratings	3-Heavy	2-Moderate	1-Marginal	Notes				
			DW	KL	OO	LM					
Professional Development			2	2	2	2	Initial professional development would be necessary to acquaint teachers with the new organizational structure, but the structure is clear and concise, so this could likely be done quite efficiently in PLCs. The nature of standards should be nothing "new" for teachers, and the acclimation period would likely be short. Current textbooks would likely support these standards. Technology is heavily integrated into the standards, so schools would need the capability for large numbers of students to research and create a variety of projects and media presentations collaboratively.				
Technology			1	2	2	2					
Textbooks			2	1	2	2					
Personnel			1	1	2	2					
Total			6	6	8	8					
Part IV: Readiness for Next Level of Learning			Ratings	3-Strong evidence	2-Moderate Evidence	1-Minimal Evidence	Notes				
			DW	KL	OO	LM					
K-5 Standards Only: Standards allow for learners to attain essential, foundational skills to build upon for reading in grades 6-12			3		3	0	These standards would prepare students to meet the demands of the ACT and SAT.				

Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - Virginia

Grades 6-12 Standards Only: Standards will prepare students for academic demand of ACT/SAT as gateway tests for post-secondary admissions														
			3	3		3								
Total			6	3	3	3								
	Grand Total		26	26	28	27								

## Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - North Carolina

Matrix for Reviewing State Level Standards							
Part I: Implications for Instruction			Ratings:	2-Yes	1-Inconsistent	0-Not Evident	Notes
			DW	KL	OO	LM	
Appropriate Sequencing for Instruction			2	1		1	The current CCSS wording can many times be convoluted. Terminology can be used interchangeably (main idea vs. theme), and standards often seem to overlap rather than build on one another. It can be difficult to determine which standards should be taught in which grade level, as 9th and 10th, and 11th and 12th are groupe, leading to inconsistency from school to school, or even from classroom to classroom within an idividual school. The verbose nature of many standards leaves ambiguity in exactly what minimum achievement for a particular standard would look like.
Indication of Minimum Acheivement			1	1		1	
Efficient Conversion to Instruction			1	1		1	These standards have already proven to be difficult for teachers to convert to instruction as substantiated by statewide student achievement on English/LA end of year assessments. Teachers continue to learn how to "unpack" these students even though they have been in place for a few years now. There has not been enough professional development, time, and curriculum materials accessbile to teachers to advance teachers' ability to convert the standards to efficient. Even though the standards are the same for all teachers, implementation varies from classroom to classroom and school to school.
Age Appropriate Skills and Concepts			1	1		1	Heavy emphasis on text complexity and on grade level lexile levels. While this does ensure all students are at a minimum exposed to grade level instruction, the same level of emphasis is not placed on providing students with texts that are aligned to their instructional need.
Total			5	4	0	4	
Part II: Clarity and Focus			Rating:	3-Wording supports understanding, purpose, & expectation	2-Wording moderately supports understanding, purpose, & expectation	1 Wording does not support understanding, purpose & expectation	Notes
			DW	KL	OO	LM	

## Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - North Carolina

					Wording in CCSS can at times be difficult for a trained educator to understand. Wordy standards containing copious amounts of literary jargon can seem impenetrable for some parents, and many in the general public. In addition, many single standards contain what appears to be several standards compacted together (.Ex: CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.9-10.1.A Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.) This standard requires students to introduce claims, distinguish claims, and organize claims,as well as be able to identify alternate claims, relationships between claims, and identify appropriate reasons and evidence. This single standard incorporates nearly seven different skills that students must either have already mastered or be taught. These standards have already proven to be difficult for teachers to convert to instruction as substantiated by statewide student achievement on English/LA end of year assessments. Teachers continue to learn how to "unpack" these standards to gain clarity even though they have been in place for a few years now. There has not been enough professional development, time, and curriculum materials accessible to teachers to advance teachers'understanding or ability to convert the standards to effective instruction. Even though the standards are the same for all teachers, implementation varies from classroom to classroom and school to school. This demonstrates a lack of clarity.	
Understanding by Teachers	2	2		1		
Understanding by Parents/General Public	1	1		1		
Streamlined Learning Expectations/Concise	2	2		1		
Total	5	5	0	3		
Part III: Implementation and Sustainability		Ratings	3-Heavy	2-Moderate	1-Marginal	Notes
		DW	KL	OO	LM	
Professional Development	3	3		1	To align teacher understanding and consistency of implementation across the state, the CCSS required immense amounts of professional development. It also required teachers to be familiar with not only the specific standards, but also with hundreds of pages of ancillary materials in the form of unpacking documents and crosswalks from the original Standard Course of Study.	
Technology	2	3		1		
Textbooks	3	3		0	Because interpretation of the standards varies and their continue to be a lack of clarity for implementation, teachers need a curriculum (to include textbooks and other materials) to support implementation. Currently, because of inconsistencies in understanding, students are getting a variety of experiences based on their teacher, their school and their LEA. In essence, teachers are doing the best they can without the resources needed to guide their understanding and provide every student in NC with some level of a common experience in their exposure. I am not supporting a scripted curriculum, but textbooks and other materials would at least provide a starting place for teachers and some level of consistency in what students experience. More textbooks/materials would also help parents understand what is expected of students. Textbooks and materials would minimize the variation in interpretation and implementation.	

## Matrix for Reviewing State Standards - North Carolina

Personnel		3	3		1	More personnel such as teacher assistants, EC teachers and ESL teachers would support students who may need differentiated instruction to help scaffold them to grade level expectations. While teachers are working hard to understand and implement the curriculum, it is even more challenging to expect them to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners in their classes. Additional personnel with expertise in the areas of student cognitive exceptionalities and English as a second language would be helpful to teachers and students who need more scaffolding and support. Teacher assistants could also help by working with students in small groups to provide additional support needed to allowed students to access on-grade level instruction and complete on-grade level tasks with mastery.
<b>Total</b>		11	12	0	3	
<b>Part IV: Readiness for Next Level of Learning</b>	<b>Ratings</b>	3-Strong evidence	2-Moderate Evidence	1-Minimal Evidence	<b>Notes</b>	
	DW	KL	OO	LM		
K-5 Standards Only: Standards allow for learners to attain essential, foundational skills to build upon for reading in grades 6-12						
Grades 6-12 Standards Only: Standards will prepare students for academic demand of ACT/SAT as gateway tests for post-secondary admissions		3	2		2	If students are able to master the standards as written for each grade level, they would likely be prepared for the ACT and SAT. However, CCSS leaves little room for teachers to differentiate for students who do not read at grade level. This results in students falling farther behind in their reading and in standards mastery. The quantity of standards (or skills within single standards) puts such a demand on available class time that there is also little room for remediation. This may very well increase the achievement gap, specifically for our lower performing students.
<b>Total</b>		3	2	0	2	
<b>Grand Total</b>		8	7	0	5	